DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 320 SP 007 944

AUTHOR Welling, James K.
TITLE Pupil Perceptions of Teachers Who Score High on Scales of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory versus Teachers Who Score Low.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 35p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; *Perception Tests; Questionnaires; *Self Actualization; *Student Reaction; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Personal Orientation Inventory

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether or not there is a significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high on Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) and pupil perceptions of teachers who score low. The POI was administered to 11 teachers of the fourth, fifth and sixth grades to measure aspects of self-actualization. The 288 pupils of the teachers involved were administered the "My Teacher" questionnaire which deals with pupil perceptions of specific teacher behaviors. The top four scores on each POI scale were matched with the low four scores, and the respective pupil responses were compared. A chi square test was used to determine significant differences. Results indicate that pupils are perceptually aware of the attitudes of teachers and that pupils are affected in different ways by teachers who are measured to be at different levels of self-actualization. The researcher recommends further study to provide empiric evidence that the POI instrument should be used as a screening device in teacher training institutions on the basis that self-actualizing teachers are the best teachers. (A literature review, a 22-item bibliography, and two appendixes are included.) (PD)

ED 091320

PUPIL PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHERS WHO SCORE HIGH ON SCALES OF SHOSTROM'S PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY VERSUS TEACHERS WHO SCORE LOW

BY

JAMES K. WELLING

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP007944

Study directed by Charles R. DuVall
Indiana University at South Bend
Spring Semester, 1974, P503

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	The Problem	2
	Definitions	3
	Limitations of the Study	3
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	7
	Instruments	7
	Population	9
	Procedure	9
IV.	RESULTS	10
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	16
	Summary	16
	Conclusions	17
	Recommendations	17
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	19
	APPENDIX	22
	Appendix A: Questionnaire	23
	Appendix B: Tables	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Raw Scores on the POI	26
2.	Comparison of Group I and Group II POI Subscores	27
3.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 01	28
4.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 02	28
5.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 03	29
6.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 04	29
7.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 05	30
8.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 06	30
9.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 07	31
10.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 08	31
11.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 09	32
12.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 10	32
13.	Pupil Responses on "My Teacher" Questionnaire, Teacher 11	33

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure Page

1. Rejected and Retained Hypotheses 12

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It is widely assumed within the field of education that the teacher is a significant variable regarding the processes which take place in the classroom. The manner in which the teacher relates to his pupils and his attitudes toward his pupils influence the attitudes of the child toward his teacher and toward the objects or activities with which the teacher is related. (Khan and Weiss, 1973) This consideration is particularly important when viewed in terms of affective education and the humanistic approaches to teaching behavior. Humanistic philosophy, as it applies to education, stresses the importance of learning as a priority above teaching, per se.

It is in keeping the learning of the individual foremost in mind that leads Carl Rogers to observe that no one method of teaching is most effective. (Rogers, 1969) Rather, Rogers directs his attention to the personal qualities and behaviors of teachers which may serve as external stimuli to promote growth in pupils. Certainly, this idea is compatible with the self-as-instrument thesis explored by Combs (1969) who sees the helping professions all utilizing the helper's self as the most essential and effective tool at their disposal.

If one proceeds with the understanding that every teacher is a unique individual and that his effective operation as a teacher is dependent upon his utilization of his own unique self, then one sees readily that no one method of teaching is going to work best for all teachers. Further, by the laws of perceptual psychology, behavior

is always a function of perception. A pupil will behave congruently with the nature of his field of perception. Since every pupil is unique, one may subsume that the teacher interested in establishing a viable helping relationship will recognize the importance of relating individually.

Maslow, the originator of humanistic psychology, identified five basic needs in man: food, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization. "Self-actualization" is defined as the highest level of psychologic health. Maslow believed that as people satisfied their lower needs they tended to develop such qualities as loyalty, friendliness, and civic consciousness. He reasoned, as Rogers and others did after him, that the best teacher would be a person functioning at a high level of self-actualization. (Maslow, 1954) This person would have the qualities necessary in establishing a growth-promoting -- a helping -- relationship.

It was in becoming aware of such philosophies and logic that this investigator developed an interest in pursuing an empiric knowledge of the relationship between the self-actualizing teacher and his pupils. A review of related research showed that very little had been accomplished to uphold the theories. This study begins there.

The problem. It seems very basic to the premise, that in order to assume anything about the helping relationship between teacher and pupil there must be a demonstrable difference in the way pupils respond to teachers at different levels of self-actualization. Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) (Shostrom, 1966) was deemed of merit in determining levels of self-actualization in

teachers. Since the POI measures conceptually important elements of self-actualization, whether or not pupils respond differently to teachers who score high or low on the elemental scales of the POI may be even more basic. Therefore, the general hypothesis for this study stated there is no significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high on scales of the POI and teachers who score low.

Definitions. Throughout this report the following definitions will apply:

Teacher-a person employed in an official capacity for the purpose of guiding and directing the learning experience of pupils or students in an educational institution whether public or private.

Pupil-one who attends a school of elementary level.

Perceive-awareness of external objects, conditions, relationships, etc., as a result of sensory stimulation.

Response-a subject's answer to a test item or questionnaire.

Any term not covered above can be found in Good's Dictionary of Education. (1973)

Limitations of the study. The primary limitation of this study was the necessity of utilizing the available population. Because of the limited population, scores on the scales of the POI in some cases were not as diverse as perhaps could be expected with a larger population. Also, the validity of the Nc (Nature of Man) scale of the POI is in question. (See Chapter III) However, in terms of relating the findings to how a teacher scored on this particular scale, the significance is not impaired, although one may question exactly what this scale measures.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study is an attempt to shed light on the problem of determining what characteristics of a teacher's personality are important to aiding establishment of a helping relationship between teacher and student in the classroom. This helping relationship is defined here as the interpersonal relationship which, when established, provides a growth-promoting climate. Rogers concluded after reviewing a number of studies, that a helping relationship differed from an unhelpful one primarily because of the attitudes of the helping person and how the relationship is perceived by the "helpee". (Rogers, 1958) Murray (1972) points out in the introduction to her study that, "the best source of information about an individual and his motives may be the individual himself," and if that individual is a teacher then, "the next best source of information would be the student." This study, like some others before it, seeks to exploit the unique relationship itself between teacher and pupil by staying within the bounds of that relationship in order to learn more about it.

In their chapter dealing with teaching affective responses, Khan and Weiss (1973) state, "teachers' attitudes toward their students are reflected in teachers' classroom behavior as perceived by students or observed by experts." They support this statement with reference to a study by Seidman and Knapp (1953). In this investigation, 17 teachers and 124 eleventh and twelfth grade students in Maine served as subjects. No significant differences

were found to exist between teachers' statements of likes and dislikes regarding their students and students' predictions about teachers' attitudes.

Silberman (1969) interviewed ten third grade teachers drawn from suburban schools in Chicago to determine the pupils toward whom they held attitudes of attachment, concern, indifference and rejection. These pupils plus two control pupils for each teacher were then interviewed and responses compared. Results showed a significant relationship between pupils' predictions about teachers' attitudes toward them and actual observed classroom behavior of the teachers.

In a study where the major thrust was to determine whether or not there is a relationship between a teacher's effectiveness in the classroom and his acceptance of himself, Reed (1953) interviewed the students of 104 secondary teachers in California. He obtained significant results which showed teachers with higher levels of self-acceptance were evaluated as more effective in the classroom by their students.

Whereas the studies cited above deal with the problem of how students perceive teachers, the two following studies relate directly to Maslow's concept of self-actualization and student perception of the self-actualizing teacher.

Murray (1972) selected 10 teachers from a random sample of 261 Pennsylvania home economics teachers. Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory was used as a basis for determining self-actualizing teachers. Five were selected from the extremes of the distribution for comparison of student perceptions. It was

shown by comparing the two groups with the norms presented by Shostrom that indeed the two groups represented self-actualizing teachers and non-self-actualizing teachers. Students' scores on Ray's Student Estimate of Teacher Concern (Ray, 1960), when compared, led Murray to conclude through statistical analysis that students perceive self-actualizing teachers as more concerned about them than non-self-actualizing teachers.

In another study, Coble (1973) investigated the relationship between the level of teacher self-actualization and student gains in critical thinking. His approach measured directly the behavior of students by administering the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal Form ZM at the beginning of the school year and again in April and recording the student responses. The sample included 424 biology students and their 18 teachers. The teachers were then divided into two groups based upon significant and nonsignificant changes that occurred in their students' critical thinking abilities. Group I was composed of eight teachers selected on the basis of significant changes and Group II consisted of 10 teachers whose students evidenced nonsignificant changes in critical thinking. Group I teachers were found to have scored significantly higher overall on Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory than the teachers of Group II.

By virtue of the review of related research this investigator found cause to attempt to further the knowledge of the aspects of self-actualizing teachers which affect their pupils.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of this study was to determine if elementary school pupils perceive differently teachers who score high on scales of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory versus teachers who score low. It was hypothesized that there would be no statistically significant difference in their perceptions.

Instruments. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was devised by Shostrom (1966) to meet the need for a comprehensive measure of values and behavior integral in developing self-actualization. It is used primarily by counselors to determine present level of mental health. A normative survey, consisting of 150 paired opposite statements of values, it yields measures of twelve areas held to be important in the development of self-actualization. The twelve areas are:

1. Tc--Time Competent; able to tie the past and the future to the present in meaningful continuity, lives more fully in the here-and-now
2. I--Inner Directed; relies on internal influences implanted at first by parents and later by other authority figures, internal motivations as opposed to external motivations
3. SAV--Self-Actualizing Values;lives by values of self-actualizing people
4. Ex--Existentiality; flexible in application of self-actualizing values to one's life
5. Fr--Feeling Reactivity; sensitive to one's own needs and feelings
6. S--Spontaneity; able to express feelings in spontaneous action
7. Sr--Self-Regard; able to like one's self because of one's strength as a person
8. Sa--Self-Acceptance; accepts one's self in spite of one's weaknesses or deficiencies

9. Nc--Nature of Man, Constructive; sees man as essentially good

10. Sy--Synergy; able to see opposites of life as meaningfully related

11. A--Acceptance of Aggression; able to accept anger or aggression within one's self as natural

12. C--Capacity for Intimate Contact; able to develop meaningful, contactful relationships with other human beings

In a test administered to 303 people, Shostrom reported the validity of the subscores as significant at the 0.01 level with the exceptions that Fr was significant at the 0.05 level and Nc was found not significant.

The selected instrument for determining pupils' perceptions of their teachers' behavior was titled "My Teacher" taken from the book, Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environments, by Fox, Luszki and Schmuck. (Fox, 1966) It is designed to give feedback as to how a pupil would change his teacher by allowing the pupil to choose the degree, if any, to which he would alter nine specific teacher behaviors. The behaviors are:

1. Helps with work
2. Yells at us
3. Makes sure our work is done
4. Asks us to decide about how we will work
5. Smiles and laughs
6. Makes us behave
7. Trusts us on our own
8. Makes us work hard
9. Shows that he understands how we feel

The choice-alternatives for change included, "much more than he does now", "a little more than he does now", "about the same as he does now", "a little less than he does now" and "a lot less than he does now".

This instrument was administered to pupils in their regular classes by the investigator while the respective teachers were out of the room. Emphasis was given to assuring the pupils that their responses would be held confidential.

Population. The population for this study consisted of 288 pupils of 11 elementary teachers of grades four, five and six at a selected northern Indiana public elementary school.

Procedure. The POI is essentially self-administering. Test booklets and answer sheets were given to the 11 teachers in February, 1974, with the understanding that they would answer as honestly as they could in order to provide data for a graduate research paper being completed by the investigator. Upon completion by the teachers the inventories were machine scored. During the first week of March, 1974, permission was obtained from the above teachers to administer the "My Teacher" instrument to their pupils. The investigator administered the instrument on three consecutive mornings to the 11 classrooms within that same week.

For analysis of the data, the teachers were divided into three groups per POI scale based upon their scores. Group I consisted of the top four scorers. Group II consisted of the four lowest scorers. The third group was made up of the three middle scorers and for the purposes of this study was disregarded. Pupils of respective Group I teachers were labelled Group I pupils. Likewise, pupils of respective Group II teachers were labelled Group II pupils.

A chi square test, as specified by the manual for the Monroe 1265 computer , was used to compare Group I pupil responses with Group II pupil responses.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The research hypothesis for the investigation stated there is no statistically significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high on scales of the POI and teachers who score low.

Statistical hypotheses were generated by using the following format:

> There is no statistically significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high versus teachers who score low on scale (a) of the POI, relative to teacher behavior, (b).

Factor (a) could be any of the twelve areas measured on the POI. Factor (b) could be any of the nine teacher behaviors represented on the "My Teacher" questionnaire.

Hence, by comparing pupil responses of Group I with pupil responses of Group II for each POI scale and each teacher behavior, 108 statistical hypotheses were tested. For example, Tc-1 represents the first statistical hypothesis tested:

> There is no statistically significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high versus teachers who score low on scale Tc (Time Competent) of the POI, relative to teacher behavior, "Helps with work".

A chi square test was used to determine if a significant difference existed between the pupil responses for Group I and the pupil responses for Group II. The rationale for using the chi square was that since, according to the principal of the school, pupils were randomly assigned to their teachers at the

in a manner similar to Group II pupils. With reference to the chi square formula Group I pupil responses were deemed f_o (frequency observed) and Group II pupil responses were deemed f_e (frequency expected). Therefore, a value computed for x^2 which might exceed probability at the 0.05 level of confidence may be interpreted as a significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

On this basis, 80 of the tested hypotheses were rejected and 28 were retained.

Figure 1 shows the rejected and retained hypotheses.

All nine hypotheses associated with each of scales I, Fr and Sa were rejected. Thus, Group I pupils responded to the behavior of their teachers differently than did Group II pupils to the behavior of theirs. This fact is most notable because the differences apply to all nine categories of teacher behavior. It would indicate that teachers who score high on the POI in the areas of Inner Directedness, Feeling Reactivity and Self-Acceptance broadly affect their pupils in a manner unlike those teachers who score low. (The reader is cautioned to keep in mind that this study does not attempt to judge whether the effects in any case are positive or negative.)

Seven out of nine hypotheses were rejected for each of the Tc, S and A scales. The investigator holds this to be a significant number of rejected hypotheses for each of these scales, especially when one considers the fact that for each of these scales the retained hypotheses were associated with the same teacher behaviors, 4 (Asks us to decide about how we will work)

POI Scale	Teacher Behavior								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Tc	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	O
I	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
SAV	X	X	O	O	X	O	O	X	O
Ex	X	O	X	X	X	X	O	X	O
Fr	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
S	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	O
Sr	X	X	O	O	X	X	O	X	X
Sa	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Nc	X	X	O	X	O	X	X	X	O
Sy	X	X	O	X	X	X	O	O	O
A	X	X	X	O	X	X	X	X	O
C	X	X	O	X	O	X	X	O	O

Figure 1. Rejected and Retained Hypotheses (X=Rejected, O=Retained)

and 9 (Shows that he understands how we feel). From the data, one may assume that teachers who score high in the areas of Time Competence, Spontaneity and Acceptance of Aggression will affect their pupils in a manner profoundly different from teachers who score low in these areas. However, pupils probably will not perceive either group of teachers as behaving much differently within the realms of pupil input into decisions about work or understanding how pupils feel.

Whereas all rejected hypotheses denote specific significance, those areas of measurement on the POI where fewer than seven of nine associated hypotheses were rejected cannot be held to be as significant overall as the areas measured on the I, Fr, Sa, Tc, S and A scales. These six scales account for 48 of the 80 rejected hypotheses and but 6 of the 28 hypotheses where pupils perceived no difference.

In viewing the data from the perspective of the pupil-response-to-teacher-behavior factor one gains a somewhat different insight. For example, pupils perceived Group I teachers significantly different from Group II teachers, when concerned with behavior category 1, relative to every subscore of the POI. In other words, a teacher who scores high in any area measured by the POI would be perceived by pupils to behave differently from a teacher who scores low when it comes to helping pupils with work.

Categories 2 and 6 each had 11 of 12 associated hypotheses rejected. Pupils perceived teachers in the "Yells at us" category differently in every area except Ex. They also perceived high scoring teachers as behaving differently in the "makes us behave" category for every case but the SAV scale.

The categories where the next most differences were perceived were 5 (Smiles and laughs) and 8 (Makes us work hard). Each were categories where 10 of 12 associated hypotheses were rejected.

The teacher behavior where pupils perceive the least difference between high scoring teachers and low scoring teachers is 9 (Shows that he understands how we feel). Only four of 12 hypotheses were rejected. This was the only category where fewer than half of the associated hypotheses were rejected.

Behavior category 7 (Trusts us on our own) yielded eight rejected hypotheses and four retained. Categories 3 (Makes sure our work is done) and 4 (Asks us to decide about how we will work) each yielded seven rejected and five retained hypotheses. The investigator interpreted these data as revealing less significance than the behavior categories mentioned above.

Considering the overall results of this investigation, one may conclude that, in general, pupils do perceive teachers who score high on scales of the POI differently from teachers who score low. Whereas previous research has shown that students are perceptually aware of the attitudes and values of their teachers, this study shows more specifically which elements measured on

the POI influence pupil perceptions as related to specific teacher behaviors.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary. The purpose of this study was to determine if pupils perceive teachers who score high on scales of Shostrom's Personal Orientation Inventory differently than they do teachers who score low. From the readings reviewed, it was evident that pupils are indeed perceptually aware of the attitudes of teachers and indications show that pupils are affected in different ways by teachers who are measured to be at different levels of self-actualization. It was reasoned that if it could be shown that pupils perceive teachers differently with regards to specific elements integral to the process of self-actualization, then steps could be taken toward supporting theories of Rogers and Combs which state that self-actualizing teachers are best equipped to provide the helping relationship deemed to be an important factor in learning.

Eleven fourth, fifth and sixth grade teachers at a selected northern Indiana school were administered the POI to obtain twelve scores on scales of the POI which measure aspects of self-actualization. The 288 pupils of the teachers involved were administered the "My Teacher" questionnaire which dealt with pupil perceptions of nine specific teacher behaviors. The top four scores on each POI scale were matched with the low four and the respective pupil responses were compared. By pairing each scale of the POI with responses to each of the nine teacher behaviors, 108 hypotheses were generated in the form:

There is no statistically significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high versus teachers who score low on scale (a) of the POI, relative to teacher behavior, (b).

Factor (a) represents any of the twelve scales of the POI and Factor (b) represents any of the nine teacher behaviors found on the "My Teacher" questionnaire.

A chi square test was used to determine significant differences. On this basis, 80 of the 108 hypotheses were rejected and 28 were retained.

Conclusions. As a result of the rejection of 80 of the 108 tested hypotheses and considering the hypotheses as the relate to the respective scales of the POI and categories of teacher behavior on the "My Teacher" questionnaire, the following conclusions were made:

1. There is a statistically significant difference between pupil perceptions of teachers who score high on the I, Fr, Sa, Tc, S and A scales of the POI and teachers who score low.

2. There is statistical evidence to suggest pupils perceive teachers who score high on the SAV, Ex, Sr, Nc, Sy and C scales differently than teachers who score low. However, the investigator views these data as less significant.

3. Categories 1 (Helps with work), 2 (Yells at us), 5 (Smiles and laughs), 6 (Makes us behave) and 8 (Makes us work hard) represent teacher behaviors where pupils perceive the most difference between teachers who score high on scales of the POI and teachers who score low.

Recommendations. The evidence of this investigation points out differences in the perceptions of pupils regarding teachers who score high on certain scales of the POI and teachers who score low. The following limitations of the study should be kept in mind:

1. Limited population of 11 teachers and 288 pupils.

2. One school participated in the investigation.

3. Questioned validity of the Nc scale of the POI.

One should also bear in mind the non-judgmental position taken by the investigator in this study. To find differences among pupils in their perceptions of teachers is not to determine positives or negatives in the ways teachers relate to their pupils.

Knight (1973) suggests the use of the POI as a screening device in teacher training institutions to keep low scoring prospective teachers out of the field. Her position is based on the assumption that self-actualizing teachers are the best teachers. Further studies are needed to provide empiric evidence that this is, in fact, so.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arkin, Herbert, and Colton, Raymond R., Tables for Statisticians, Barnes and Noble, New York, 1950.

Coble, C. R., "Self-Actualization and the Effective Biology Teacher," American Biology Teacher 35:479-481, November, 1973.

Combs, Arthur W., Florida Studies in the Helping Professions, University of Florida Press, Gainesville, 1969.

Dugdale, Kathleen, A Manual of Form for Theses and Term Reports, The Author, Bloomington, Ind., 1967.

Education Index (cumulative), The H. W. Wilson Co., New York, 1929----, 23 vols.

Fox, Robert; Luszki, Margaret Barron; and Schmuck, Richard, Diagnosing Classroom Learning Environments, Science Research Associates Inc., Chicago, 1966.

Good, Carter V., editor, Dictionary of Education, McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, 1973.

Jones, Ralph H., Methods and Techniques of Educational Research, The Interstate, Danville, Ill., 1973.

Khan, S. B., and Weiss, Joel, "The Teaching of Affective Responses," Second Handbook of Research on Teaching, Robert M. W. Travers, editor, Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1973.

Knight, Lynette Williamson, Self-Actualization: A Study of Ten People and How Their Perceptions Provide a Humanizing Approach to Education, Unpublished doctor's thesis, School of Education, Arizona State University, 1973.

Maslow, A., Motivation and Personality, Harper & Brothers, New York, 1954.

Maslow, A., Toward a Psychology of Being, Second Edition, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, 1968.

Murray, Eloise, "Students' Perceptions of Self-Actualizing and Non-Self-Actualizing Teachers," The Journal of Teacher Education, 23:383-387, Fall, 1972.

Ost, David H., "The Nature of Science, Self-Actualization, and Science Teacher Education," Science Education 57:521-524, Oct.-Dec., 1973.

Ray, E. M., "Teacher Concern Related to Teaching Effectiveness," Journal of Home Economics 52:177-180, March, 1960.

Reed, Harold J., "An Investigation of the Relationship Between Teaching Effectiveness and the Teacher's Attitude of Acceptance," Journal of Experimental Education 21:277-325, June, 1953.

Rogers, Carl R., "The Characteristics of a Helping Relationship," Personnel and Guidance Journal 37:6-16, January, 1958.

Rogers, Carl R., Freedom to Learn, Charles E. Merrill, Columbus, Ohio, 1969.

Seidman, J. M., and Knapp, L. B., "Teacher Likes and Dislikes and Student Perceptions of These Attitudes," Journal of Educational Research 47:143-149, October, 1953.

Shostrom, Everett L., Manual for Personal Orientation Inventory, Educational and Industrial Testing Service, San Diego, 1966.

Shostrom Everett L., Man, The Manipulator, Abingdon Press, New York, 1967.

Silberman, M. L., "Behavioral Expression of Teachers' Attitudes Toward Elementary School Students," Journal of Educational Psychology 60:402-407, 1969.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Questionnaire

Date _____

MY TEACHER

Pretend that you could have your teacher change in some way. For each number, check the box that best tells how you would like your teacher to act in this class. There are no right or wrong answers.

	Much more than he does now	A little more than he does now	The same as he does now	A little less than he does now	Much less than he does now
1. Help with work					
2. Yell at us					
3. Make sure work is done					
4. Ask us to decide about how we will work					
5. Smile and laugh					
6. Make us behave					
7. Trust us on our own					
8. Make us work hard					
9. Show that he understands how we feel					

Appendix B

Tables

TABLE 1. RAW SCORES ON THE POI

Teacher #	Tc	I	SAV	Ex	Fr	S	Sr	Sa	Nc	Sy	A	C
01	16	78	20	14	15	10	14	18	9	8	19	13
02	17	85	23	15	18	14	13	17	12	9	19	14
03	20	101	20	28	19	15	14	23	13	7	18	24
04	14	75	18	21	12	12	8	14	14	8	11	16
05	20	95	24	18	16	16	15	20	15	8	17	16
06	19	89	19	21	16	13	12	17	13	7	18	17
07	18	83	23	19	17	10	13	15	11	7	20	16
08	17	89	24	20	21	15	12	17	12	7	18	18
09	20	94	21	26	16	11	13	20	12	8	20	19
10	19	90	20	23	14	16	12	18	16	8	18	19
11	21	83	21	17	17	14	15	16	10	6	19	15

TABLE 2. COMPARISON OF GROUP I AND GROUP II POI SUBSCORES

	Group I		Group II	
	$\underline{X}$	range	$\underline{X}$	range
Tc	20.25	20-21	17.00	16-18
I	95.00	90-101	79.75	75-83
SAV	23.50	23-24	19.50	18-20
Ex	24.50	21-28	16.00	14-18
Fr	18.75	17-21	14.25	12-16
S	15.50	15-16	10.75	10-12
Sr	14.50	14-15	11.00	8-12
Sa	20.25	18-23	15.50	14-17
Nc	14.50	13-16	10.50	9-12
Sy	8.25	8-9	6.75	6-7
A	19.50	19-20	16.00	11-18
C	20.00	18-24	14.50	13-16

TABLE 3. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 01

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	2	16	8	0	0
2	0	1	8	13	4
3	3	7	14	1	1
4	3	15	8	0	0
5	0	8	18	0	0
6	1	8	12	4	1
7	4	7	15	0	0
8	1	8	11	6	0
9	8	11	7	0	0

TABLE 4. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 02

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	4	18	5	0	0
2	0	0	1	9	17
3	2	5	17	3	0
4	6	6	9	5	1
5	12	15	0	0	0
6	1	5	12	7	2
7	9	12	6	0	0
8	0	1	7	14	5
9	12	7	6	2	0

TABLE 5. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 03

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	6	15	5	0	0
2	1	1	4	12	8
3	1	5	18	2	0
4	9	6	6	4	1
5	15	6	4	1	0
6	2	4	12	6	2
7	14	9	1	2	0
8	1	3	6	9	7
9	12	10	3	0	1

TABLE 6. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 04

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	0	5	22	0	0
2	1	2	20	3	1
3	3	8	9	7	0
4	3	5	13	5	1
5	0	6	21	0	0
6	3	9	12	3	0
7	4	8	12	2	1
8	1	3	19	1	3
9	4	11	10	1	1

TABLE 7. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 05

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little less...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	3	10	9	5	4
2	0	0	6	5	20
3	2	4	13	7	5
4	4	13	6	6	2
5	15	6	5	2	3
6	1	4	3	11	12
7	14	5	8	2	2
8	1	3	3	11	13
9	13	12	4	1	1

TABLE 8. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 06

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little less...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	8	9	7	2	0
2	0	1	4	3	18
3	1	3	11	3	8
4	5	10	7	1	3
5	12	6	8	0	0
6	6	1	8	2	9
7	12	6	8	0	0
8	0	4	6	4	12
9	12	7	3	4	0

TABLE 9. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 07

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	6	8	15	1	0
2	1	1	13	10	5
3	3	8	16	2	1
4	7	11	10	1	1
5	13	7	10	0	0
6	5	8	12	5	0
7	8	11	11	0	0
8	1	4	14	10	1
9	11	13	6	0	0

TABLE 10. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 08

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	7	13	8	2	0
2	0	1	11	12	6
3	2	5	16	7	0
4	12	10	8	0	0
5	9	9	11	1	0
6	2	2	23	2	1
7	12	11	7	0	0
8	0	5	15	7	3
9	8	9	13	0	0

TABLE 11. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 09

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	7	1	12	2	0
2	0	1	6	6	9
3	2	1	12	3	4
4	6	7	7	0	2
5	8	6	7	0	1
6	4	0	12	1	5
7	9	3	6	2	0
8	1	2	4	7	8
9	7	6	6	1	2

TABLE 12. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 10

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	2	5	11	2	0
2	0	0	9	3	8
3	2	0	15	1	2
4	3	6	9	2	0
5	4	7	9	0	0
6	1	3	9	1	6
7	6	6	8	0	0
8	0	0	15	1	4
9	4	7	9	0	0

TABLE 13. PUPIL RESPONSES ON "MY TEACHER" QUESTIONNAIRE, TEACHER 11

Teacher behavior	Much more...	A little more...	The same...	A little less...	Much less...
1	3	7	12	1	0
2	0	0	4	7	12
3	2	2	14	3	2
4	4	5	13	1	0
5	14	3	5	1	0
6	5	2	12	2	2
7	9	5	8	1	0
8	1	2	12	4	4
9	8	3	12	0	0